

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXIII, No. 5 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper May, 1982

EYE - OPENERS

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE.

Anyone who was alive and politically conscious at the time of Suez, and also has a reliable memory, should recognise the familiar scenario presented to the national gaze in recent weeks. *Then* we (the "common people," that is) were all raring to go "to regain British sovereignty over the Base; to rescue and repossess some hundred million pounds or so worth of British property abandoned in the Canal Zone," whilst in undertones the voice that breathed in Eden was murmuring, "We are going there to establish an International Police Force." This announcement was so nearly inaudible that it could be safely ignored by ninety-nine per cent of the media, and thus it disappeared into the limbo of indiscreet eye-openers. Still, it was too much for our financial masters, whose mouthpiece Eisenhower ordered the British Prime Minister to withdraw the already successful operations of the British troops and the ships of the Royal Navy. He did so, and was retired among his antiques for his pains. The British lion was labelled a lame and mangy failure incapable of protecting his own.

Dismal Battle-Cry

NOW we are again raring to go and rescue an even more previous cargo of eighteen hundred or so human beings of British stock, and regain our sovereignty — sorry, re-assert our "administration" — in the Falkland Isles, whilst at three o'clock in the morning some BBC World Service commentator is mentioning in passing that "we are fighting for the principle of international law." Somehow, we cannot feel that "the principle of international law" will receive any more mass media coverage in this context than did Anthony Eden's "international police force" in 1956. It is not a battle-cry likely to arouse the necessary patriotic fervour essential to popularise an enterprise so out of "democratic" character.

As G. K. Chesterton said — or words to the same effect — no men go to war to defend the fishing rights in Hang Chow harbour or wherever. They go to fight for England, Home and Beauty (or their native equivalents), which in this case is taken to mean our fellow countrymen, though

they be eight thousand miles away. However, if we believe that, we shall be deceived. The pages of even our unrevised history books tell one true tale. We have fought to "end all wars." We have fought for "Democracy" or "the United Nations." We have fought to "establish an International Police Force." We may yet fight for "the principle of international law." *Never* in living memory have we fought for England, Home and Beauty, whatever we *thought* we were, or will be, doing. Ever since the "Glorious Revolution" of 1668, we have been cozened into fighting in the pursuance of the "One World" ambition that motivates the secret consortium of Zionist-orientated usurers we know as the Money Power.

If our people have at last had their eyes opened to the foregoing truth, surely we must ask why Maggie Thatcher is presently so seemingly implacable about the sovereignty of a dependency the other side of the globe when our own land under our feet and the seas around our shores have been, with governmental encouragement, progressively occupied by a rag, tag and bobtail of aliens from all five continents in the sacred name of the multi-racial, multi-unfaithful society? Can it be that all "Right-wing extremists" must be manoeuvred into doing the Banksters' will one way or another — all same Rhodesians?

The obvious reluctance with which the Iron Lady dispensed with the services of her associate in the Rhodesian rape should provide us with an early warning of the next "surprise" incursion from another graduate of the West's do-it-yourself open university course in modern warfare. Whether Lord Carrington was the junior or senior partner in treasonable activities will be found to be immaterial if, in the two years of the Abbe de Nantes' timetable, we find that we must substitute the USSR and "the West" for Argentina and the Falkland Isles. Confusion is the name of the political game as we well know, so what will be the trend of the national will in the next "crisis" when by our silence — possibly involuntary — we have acquiesced in the clouds of glory and universal acclaim accorded a double-dyed traitor on his voluntary resignation from

a Ministry that has delivered one erstwhile British territory to a set of murdering Marxist thugs, and proposes to deliver another British territory to what was styled a "tinpot facist junta"? After those, shall we really boggle at a "peaceful settlement" with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? Doubtless we shall expect that atheist power whom the West has armed better than itself to be even more gentle than "those torturing South Americans" whose brutality is so well attested by the same entrepreneurs who sold us the "six million holocaust" . . . and a more unlikely tale than that it would be hard to find!

Whatever transpires in the next few weeks, we may be sure of one thing — under our present international masters, no "solution" will be designed to enhance the sovereignty of any nation state.

SHOTS IN THE I.T.V. LOCKER

Those telephoto glimpses of furtive figures looking over their shoulders before entering unidentifiable doorways seen in *World in Action* on Monday, April 5th, the audience was told, were Argentine naval officers, personally responsible for the torture and disappearance of "thousands of innocent Argentine citizens." They were in England to buy ships and weapons for the Argentine defence forces. It would be enlightening to know:

- a) who authorised the taking of such deliberately slanted pictures of Government-invited visitors at that time?
- b) why were they not shown to the public at once if the aim was to prevent arms deals with "torturing regimes"?

FROM DUSTBINS TO DUSTMEN

If we didn't permit the legal murder of millions of babies in their mothers' wombs, perhaps our dustmen's wives would not have to spend £8,000 to assimilate South American Indian babies into British family life, as newspaper reports revealed last month.

The Publishing Event of the Year!

HOLOCAUST NEWS

The Newspaper that exposes

THE MYTH OF THE SIX MILLION

Only 30p. (including postage) from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

A LONG WAY TO PORT STANLEY

Nott, MP, Right Honourable
 And Carrington, the Lord
 Peering through their glasses
 At happenings abroad
 And whilst one was in Palestine
 The other looked askew
 As Argentina's regatta
 Prepared to cross the blue.
 Ten thousand swarthy soldiers
 Ferried like sardines
 With tanks and planes and missiles
 To battle with marines —
 Fifty of the British
 To hold the hordes at bay
 Defending British Falklands
 Down Argentina way.
 From Portsmouth and from Plymouth
 A Task Force soon unlatched
 The lion gets uneasy
 When its backside is scratched;
 From east of Gibraltar
 The Royal Navy drew
 On patrolling battleships
 To join the Falklands queue
 Three weeks and seven thousand
 Miles to contemplate
 The folly of a policy
 Which preached — "Let's hesitate"
 When all the signs and portents
 Were very plain to see
 The Argentines so desperate for
 A cut-price victory.
 But somewhere there is laughter
 When friends go off to war
 Each to destroy the other
 And grow in debt much more;
 Discreetly in the background
 An international kite
 Makes a credit entry
 In audit of the night.
 Alas, at once so senseless,
 Yet how could Britain stay
 Her hand when the "defenseless"
 Was Argentina's way.

B. E. BIGGS.

Read **SPEARHEAD**, the monthly magazine edited
 by John Tyndall. Sample copy 47p. from
 Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DISTRIBUTISM

by ANTHONY COONEY

What became known as the Distributist movement was the result of the coalescence of several elements — Catholic, artistic, literary and the Romantic Revival. The philosophy of Distributism was made explicit by the publication in 1891 of the papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* ("Of New Things"). The encyclical reviewed the development of Capitalism and examined the arguments of Socialism, which it rejected as being opposed to the Rational Nature of Man. It then outlined the immediate and necessary requirements of Social Justice to alleviate the lot of property-less workers in a Capitalist economy — the fair wage, decent working conditions, reasonable hours, friendly societies, etc., etc. — and finally enunciated the authentic Christian alternative to both Capitalism and Socialism: the re-institution of widely distributed *property* as the norm of society.

"We have seen that this great labour question cannot be solved save by assuming as a principle that *private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable*. The law, therefore, should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many as possible of the people to become owners . . . The result of civil change and revolution has been to divide society . . . On the one side there is the party which holds power because it holds wealth . . . On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude . . . If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the gulf between vast wealth and sheer poverty can be bridged and the respective classes will be brought nearer to one another. A further consequence will be the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which belongs to them; nay, they learn to love the very soil that yields . . . not only food but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them . . . Men would cling to the country of their birth, for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a decent and happy life. *These three important benefits, however, can be reckoned on, only provided that a man's means be not drained by excessive taxation. The right to possess property is derived from nature, not from man*; the State would, therefore, be unjust and cruel if by taxation it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fair" (*Rerum Novarum*, para 35).

Unfortunately, it was to the ameliorative aspects of the encyclical that the attention of its most

enthusiastic supporters was directed. Of those who might be thought of as quasi-official Catholic spokesmen only two, Fr. Fahey and Fr. McNabb, appear to have thought beyond the ameliorative aspects. Indicative of the failure in Catholic circles to grasp the *essence* of the encyclical's doctrine is the title given to the English translation — "The Workers' Charter."

With hindsight, it is possible to see why the Catholic authors neglected the real teaching of *Rerum Novarum*. To call for the reform of Capitalism was to swim with the tide. Eventually, Capitalism was modified into the Affluent Society, and nothing further has been heard of *Rerum Novarum* in Catholic circles these past twenty years. To work for the reversal of Capitalism and its Tweedle-dum, Socialism, was much more difficult. This fatal neglect was lamented by Pope Pius XI in his sequel to *Rerum Novarum*, the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. After reviewing the maturation of Socialism into Leninism and of Capitalism into Managerialism, Pius XI re-affirmed the authentic Christian social doctrine of *Rerum Novarum*, but with little more effect than his predecessor.⁽¹⁾

Distributism's "Heart"

Rerum Novarum's contribution to Distributism, whilst ultimately indispensable, was cerebral. For the "heart" of Distributism and its springs of action, we must look to a movement in English culture which was both widespread and potent. A convenient starting point might be the reaction to the Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions led by William Cobbett in books, pamphlets and his weekly *Cobbett's Register*. Contemporary with Cobbett's reaction in the social field was the reaction of Romanticism in the artistic and literary fields against the self-styled "Enlightenment". The discovery of "Nature" by the Lakes poets was also a discovery of the ruins of castles and monasteries. The Romance was not entirely right in its conception of the culture which had built these edifices, but it was right in its realisation that the Middle Ages was not a dark and barbarous interlude between two civilisations, but a highly elaborated and articulated culture which could look that of Graeco-Rome in the face. It was the "Enlightenment" which had sneeringly dubbed the Western architectural mode "Gothic", but the serious scholarship which the Romantic idea of "the splendour falls on castle walls" stimulated, discovered that "Gothic" demonstrated a science of mathematics

and geometry in advance of that of Greece and Rome and an understanding of Neo-Platonism which antedated the Renaissance.⁽²⁾ The re-discovery of the Mediaeval achievement resulted in a hostility toward the Renaissance — Ruskin wrote of “the pure poison of Raphael” — and it was this antagonism which produced one of the most important cultural movements of the nineteenth century — Pre-Raphaelitism.

Pre-Raphaelitism fused into a single consciousness the High Romance and the reaction to Industrialism. It gave birth to the first *action* which could be described as “Distributist” rather than “Collectivist”. Whilst William Morris talked of “Socialism”, Ruskin went to the Lakes to form the Guild of Saint George,⁽³⁾ a venture typical of many attempts at the restoration of crafts, guilds and proprietorship, which culminated at the turn of the century in the launching of *The New Age* by A. R. Orage.

Orage had persuaded the Fabian Society to finance *The New Age* as a critical review. However, editing it crystallized Orage's own thinking, which he systematized as “guild Socialism”. A nation-wide movement grew up around *The New Age*, much to the chagrin of the Fabians who felt they had been deceived and who launched *The New Statesman*, first to counter the influence of, and later destroy, Orage's ‘paper’.

There is one further thread to consider: the actual bringing together of the social doctrine of *Rerum Novarum* and the cultural, literary and social ideas represented by Pre-Raphaelitism, *The New Age* and a host of other such movements and journals into a single system labelled “Distributism”.

It was Hilaire Belloc who coined the term “Distributism”. Belloc was half French, though he grew up in England. After graduating from Oxford, he considered it a matter of honour to report for French army service. In the marches and manoeuvres across France, he had first-hand experience of a freeholding peasantry which had escaped Enclosures and the Agricultural Revolution⁽⁴⁾ and which both Ricardian and Marxist economics had assured him could not possibly exist because of the operation of “the Iron Laws of Economics”! The supremacy of observed fact over theory characterized Belloc's thinking ever afterwards. Belloc's taste in art and literature was classical rather than Romantic, and his approach to problems, cerebral. A Catholic intellectual, he reached the core teaching of *Rerum Novarum* in one leap. Belloc is rightly called the founder of English Distributism, but his chief contribution must be that he presented the case for Distributism in the Economists' own terms. The importance of this can scarcely be overstated. The great disputations of history are never resolved, for

the simple reason that they are conducted on different horizontal plains. Linguistically, protagonist and antagonist never meet; they by-pass each other, each with his linguistic reality intact.⁽⁵⁾ Before Belloc, the argument was Capitalism versus — well, what? “Naturalism” was Science versus Romance, Reason versus Sentiment. In *The Servile State* and *The Essay On Distributism*, Belloc took the terminology of classical Economics and built from it a logical case for Distributism as the guarantor of human freedom: “If we do not restore the Institution of Property, we cannot escape restoring the Institution of Slavery; there is no third course” (*The Servile State*).

It might be useful here to formulate the tenets of Distributism as they emerge from Belloc's thinking:

*The social objective must be to ensure *Distribution* among a majority of the families of the Nation of ownership of productive property.

*Law and Custom must both encourage the spread of, and defend against acquisitive wealth, small property.

*The making of things, whether for subsistence, comfort or ornament, is not simply an “economic” activity, as Marxists and Capitalists maintain, but a human activity, part of the personal integrity of the maker; that there exists an organic relationship, embodied in what we call “craftsmanship” between the maker and the object, and the organisation of production must be based upon this fact.

*That men are socialised by their National community into their human identity, and the Nation therefore constitutes the “natural” unit of mankind; both Imperialism and Inter-nationalism are pathogenic to the Nation.

“Chesterbelloc”

Distributism is inalienably associated with the partnership between Belloc and G. K. Chesterton — the “Chesterbelloc”. The partnership began with the founding of *The Eyewitness* by Belloc and Cecil Chesterton, a ‘paper forever famous for its exposure of the Marconi scandal and which was subject to the vengeance of the Ascendancy for its stance on the Boer War. Unlike the Liberal-Pacifist pro-Boers who were against the war because “war is wrong”, *The Eyewitness* was pro-Boer because it said that the Boer farmers were right to fight for their little Agrarian Republics against International Finance and the Gold Interest. In spite of the partnership, G. K. Chesterton was in many ways different to Belloc. He was educated at the Slade in the after-glow of Pre-Raphaelitism. He belonged firmly to the High Romance. From boyhood agnosticism and Fabianism, he had reasoned his way to Anglo-Catholic and a Distributist position before meeting Belloc.⁽⁶⁾

Distributism does not feature largely in Belloc's major writing, which apart from *The Servile State*, *The Party System*, *The Free Press* and the *Essay On Distributism*, is chiefly historical, biographical, travel and critical essays. Chesterton's writing, on the other hand, is saturated with Distributism, though only one book, *The Outline Of Sanity*, is explicitly an exposition of Distributist ideas. Distributism is so much a part of the warp and woof of Chesterton's thought that a man might read the greater part of his books without being aware of the ideas he is imbibing. It requires an awakened perception to bring Chesterton's Distributist message into consciousness.

In a fabulous novel, *Tales Of The Long Bow*, Chesterton relates the story of an eccentric American millionaire who, having made his fortune out of manufacturing silk purses from sows' ears, buys up vast tracts of England to build model villages and pig farms. He is persuaded that the *real* philanthropy would be to give the tenants the free holds as a gift, and so an English peasantry is re-created. Aghast at this, the Ascendancy rush to nationalize the land, providing in the Bill for themselves to be appointed Controllors of their own estates at princely salaries. The reaction is a new and successful Peasants' Revolt.

The Return Of Don Quixote is an hilarious story of a Professor of history and a fas-ces of Industrialists who, cashing in on Mediaevalism, re-institute the Gilds as a means of disciplining the "Working Classes". It is a two-edged sword, for the Professor takes them before the new Gild Courts and, as they are unable to produce Masters' certificates in the manufactures they control by capital, they are disbarred from trade and a new age of Master-proprietors is ushered in.

In *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, Chesterton prognosticates an Ascendancy whose members are subject to blackmail because of the skeletons in their cupboards. They spinelessly accede to the importation of hordes of coloured aliens to fill the mines and factories for the final crushing of the English. There is a reaction, but an Asian power exercises its rights under International Law to protect its nationals, and prepares for the invasion of an apparently prostrate Britain. There are still sufficient men of integrity in the Army to rally the Nation to its defence, and at the last minute victory is snatched from defeat.

The Flying Inn is another prognostication. A Prime Minister having no Christian Faith embraces mohammedanism. He closes the pubs and bans drink — except for the rich who, by a clause in the

Act, can drink if they own an inn sign. He establishes, in secret, an alien mohammedan army to crush opposition. To no avail, the banning of their beer is the one thing which awakens Englishmen from their long torpor, and in a fury terrible to behold, internationalism, soggy-liberalism and general rottenness are swept out of England for ever. It is in this book that Chesterton describes Imperialism: "Conquest of barbarians, employment of barbarians, conquest by barbarians."

In his most atmospheric book, "The Man who Was Thursday", Chesterton parodies the busy-body state by having the supreme council of the Anarchists — the Council of Seven — composed entirely of Secret Service infiltrators who all spy on each other. In *The Napoleon of Notting Hill*, Chesterton stated the case for National Sovereignty — Political Distributism — anticipating the idea which C. H. Douglas was to put into academic language: "The smaller the genuine political unit, the nearer we are to the self-determination of the individual."

These fantasies, then, rather than learned monographs, are the texts of Distributism and this is how it should be, for Distributism is not an academic theory, but the commonsense of the Folk: "Property, like muck, must be spread."

Practical Steps

As the ideas labelled "Distributism" clarified, the title of *The Eyewitness* was changed to *The New Eyewitness*, which continued in publication into the post-1914—18 War period. After its failure, Chesterton and Belloc continued to expound their ideas in Orage's *New Age* and it was in this journal that Distributism and the Social Credit of Major C. H. Douglas first met. With the failure of *The New Age* and subsequent collapse of the Guild Socialist Movement, Chesterton determined to take some practical steps. He launched his own paper, *G.K.'s Weekly*, in reminiscence of *Cobbett's Weekly* and a number of people formed a Distributist League. This was the first time any effort had been made to make Distributism, as such, a political force. If we judge the League by the conventional canons applied to political pressure groups, it would be difficult to claim any successes for it. Chesterton was of the opinion (?) that with British agriculture in the doldrums, many landlords would be glad to sell land at low prices. Parliament, in fact, was persuaded to vote a small amount of money for grants for the purchase of small-holdings. If the League had made re-settlement on the land its sole aim, perhaps larger sums could have been obtained. In fact, it did not. Distributists charged into battle on behalf of the

London East End parents who resisted the compulsory vaccination of their children and the first inroads of the busy-body state. But perhaps we owe it to the League that de wo not yet live under the sort of social-worker terror which now rules Sweden. Again, the League was drawn into the battle for organic farming against the chemical industry. Distributists felt this battle was vital for small property, and perhaps it was, but there were other groups fighting the issue to whom it could have been left. However, if there are today thousands who can proclaim the virtues of organic husbandry without being drowned by the jeers of "muck and mysticism" and "back to the oil lamp age", the respectability of their point of view is due in no small measure to the work of the League.

The League's successes, therefore, were long term. It drew into the Distributist cause writers and artists such as Eric Gill, Augustus John and a number of lesser lights whose ideas rubbed off and cropped up in the media in a later age. The League, however, did not confine itself to ideas. Fr. McNabb re-established a number of East End families in small-holdings in East Anglia. George Maxwell established a craftsman's colony and began to make hand-loom — a success story today. Harold McCrone established a Distributist group at Corby on the last open-field system in England, which still thrives.

Not all Distributist advocacy or action was centred on the League. There was the "Back to the Land" movement and the Catholic Land League and it might be argued that every Allotment and Craft Association is a *practical* Distributist group.

After G. K. Chesterton's untimely death in 1936, his 'paper was sold to the League and renamed *The Weekly Review*. It survived the war and, in fact, was responsible for the conversion of Douglas Hyde, news editor of the *Daily Worker*, to both Distributism and Catholicism.⁽⁸⁾ By 1948, however, support had fallen off to the extent that it was necessary to replace it with a little monthly, *The Register*, and this appears to have failed before 1950. In 1953, after the death of Chesterton's right hand man, H. D. C. Pepler, Aidan Mackey gathered a handful of Distributists together to start a small monthly, *The Distributist*, which survived until 1958. There was a Distributists Society at Glasgow University as late as 1956, whilst in the same year in the United States an attempt was made to launch a Distributist University. It was from the Distributists in 1953-54 that A. K. Chesterton drew his first support for the founding of this journal and for its

supporting organisation, the League of Empire Loyalists.

What of Distributism today? Its principles are as valid as ever. Paradoxically, the technological advances of the past two decades *favour* decentralisation of production and of ownership. It is not merely that the potter, weaver or cabinet-maker can now, by means of electricity, plug into his workshop the water-power which two hundred years ago drove the master-craftsman out of business; it is not merely that machinery which once filled a room has now been reduced to table-top size. Rather, the modern automated factory simply does not need "hands". It is conceivable that in the society of the future such factories will make all that is necessary, without much human supervision, and men will make with their hands and small machines all the things which are useful and beautiful. The choice is a *political* choice. Technology has now reached a stage of development where it really is *neutral* in determining the structure of society and the economy. Has not our "post-industrial economy" become the media's in-pharse during 1981? It is a question, then, not of "the Iron Laws of Economics" (which are merely human conventions) but of a *political programme*. Such a programme should be aimed at securing legislation which will facilitate the wider distribution of small property and small business. It must also be aimed at defending them from the tax-gatherer and the usurer, not to mention the ten-percenter and take-over bidder. There remains the question of the necessary large-scale industry. Again, distributed ownership is the key, and share-holding provides the answer. Part of a political programme for Distributism should be directed at obtaining an investment by the Treasury in new, high technology of, say, £1,000 for every child born. The investment should be of newly created Crown credit and the share certificates, with their accumulated interest, should become the *property* of the child at, say, age twenty-one. The income deriving from this share in the ownership of large-scale industry would then provide the basis for self-employment in small-scale craft production.

Such a programme does not need a "League" or "Party" or any other such organisation to pursue it, but it does need advocacy by *existing* Nationalist groups in alliance with such non-political associations as are formed by the self-employed and the small-business man. The alternatives are very stark — either the Marxist Revolution or the Managerial Revolution, both leading back to a new Dark Age of servile status for all.

References:

1. H. H. Pope Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, Catholic Truth Society (1936 — revised ed.), paras. 44-62, 105-115.
2. Von Simon, "The Gothic Cathedral" in *Changes in Mediaeval Society*.
3. T. Hilton, *The Pre-Raphaelites*, Thames and Hudson (1970).
4. c.f. P. Oyler, *Feeding Ourselves*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.
5. c.f. C. Wright Mills, "Language, Logic and Culture" in I. L. Horowitz (ed.), *Power Politics and People*, O.U.P. (1963).
6. c.f. G. K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy*, Collins (1961).
7. G. K. Chesterton, *The Outline Of Sanity*, Methuen (1928).
8. Douglas Hyde, *I Believed*, Pan Books (1953), chs. XV-XXII.

A List of Further Reading will appear in the next issue of *Candour*.

"ECUMENICAL SOUP"

A new booklet from the Christian Affirmation Campaign, entitled *Ecumenical Soup*, accuses the British and World Councils of Churches of replacing Christianity and the other world religions with a vague creed of universal brotherhood — an "ecumenical soup".

The author, Bernard Smith, national secretary of C.A.C., points out that the Councils are no longer just concerned with uniting churches: their aim is now to unite all mankind. But the world religions with their rival claims to truth are an obstacle to this: they divide the "family of mankind". Publications of both Councils are quoted to show that the policy is now to ignore differences of belief and "to sink our differences and seek together the common good".

A British Council of Churches' pamphlet is quoted which discourages evangelism and derides proselytism as "a spurious form of mission". Ordinary Christians are no longer expected to promote or defend their faith since that might create dissension in a multi-faith society. Theological convictions, says the booklet, have become the "unforgivable sin". The B.C.C. avoids theology and instead it encourages people of different faiths to work together for social and political goals such as world peace and human rights. These are "safe" areas compared with theology.

The booklet describes inter-faith services as "promiscuous intercourse" and views them as a further attempt to popularise the false idea that world religions have a common core of belief in universal brotherhood. Christianity's claim that God revealed himself uniquely in Jesus of Nazareth is now seen as an obstruction to a unified humanity. The Councils' policy must, therefore, be recognised as a serious threat to the survival of Christianity.

Ecumenical Soup is available at 30p (plus 15p postage) or three for £1 (post free) from C.A.C., 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, West Sussex.

We would like to inform readers that the article "Liberals Badly Shaken By Whelan Statement" in our February issue was written by Mr. Ivor Benson.

THE CHURCH AND THE I.R.A.

As a Catholic reader of *Candour*, I was most interested in the remarks made by Robert Blake in the January issue about the Church and the I.R.A.

The teaching of the Church is very clear and is expressed in the Catechism which I quote verbatim: "It is sinful to belong to any Secret Society that plots against the Church or State, or to any Society that by reason of its secrecy is condemned by the Church."

Following the spate of I.R.A. bombing outrages in the Midlands just before the outbreak of war in 1939, a joint meeting of the English and Irish bishops reaffirmed the existing ban on the I.R.A. as such a society, and that any member of this organisation incurred an automatic ban of excommunication — a directive which was carried out.

Dominic Behan (the brother of Brendan Behan) stated in his autobiography *Borstal Boy* that when he was sentenced for complicity in these offences and membership of the I.R.A., the Catholic chaplain of Wilton Prison, Liverpool, refused to admit him to the Sacraments on this ground.

In short, the powers are there if Cardinal O'Fee, Primate of All-Ireland, cares to use them. Why he does not can only be a matter for speculation — **ROBERT HUXTABLE.**

DOWRY is the new quarterly magazine of Catholic poetry. Single copies 50p (including postage) from Rose Cottage, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH.

Read David Irving's **FOCAL POINT** for a new approach to the policies Britain needs. Write to Focal Point, Suite 411, 76 Shoe Lane, London E.C.4.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today !

U.K. £4.00

Overseas airmail £4.50

U.S.A. Dollar Rate \$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

It is pleasing to see the less subsversive type of Labour anti-Marketeer taking an interest again in the Commonwealth alternative to the EEC, as is the case in a new pamphlet, *The Commonwealth Option*, by Bryan Gould and Douglas Jay. So far from being the "dwindling, ingrate band of White brothers," as one otherwise-excellent journal which should know better described them, the Dominions can still provide Britain with the natural basis for close trade links once we remove ourselves from the Market's clutches. These countries only attach deep dishonour to the British name through the bad faith of successive British governments. Australia, for instance, sent her trade missions all over the Orient in a desperate search for alternative markets for her wheat, meat, dairy products and dried fruits because she was faced with the EEC's stiff tariff barriers if she did not. The loss of Commonwealth trade is not irretrievable and there can be no doubt that a move away from Market membership would create a situation from which we and our kinfolk overseas can both benefit.

* * * *

The announcement of large salary increases over the last year for company directors and leading officials of the Establishment has made MPs clamour to ensure they should not be left out. Their suggestion is that their pay should be index-linked to average earnings of similar "workers". There are to be no strict four per cent cash limits for these characters! I blame the Members of Parliament most of all for the ruination of this country and its economy and now they are to reward themselves by a bare-faced plundering of public funds. Will this shocking abuse by the politicians call up indignation in the population? I trust so, for it is *our* money that is to provide their pickings.

* * * *

All the television cameras showed Roy Jenkins grinning from ear to ear, his visage lit up with unconcealed delight, following the announcement of his election victory at Hillhead. Truly, the people had spoken. But I wonder how far the smile of self-love was wiped off his face when he read *The Observer's* tale, in the wake of his win, of the canvasser who asked a woman for whom she was going to vote. "Mr. Jenkins," she said. "Why?" asked the canvasser. "Because I'm anti-Common Market." "But Roy Jenkins is the ultimate pro-European,"

the astonished party-worker retorted. "He was President of the EEC Commission." "O aye," answered the voter, "but he *did* leave it, didn't he?" If that is the kind of support on which the SDP band-wagon is based electorally — and I strongly suspect it is — the chances are it will be suffering from collapsed suspension before much longer.

* * * *

Just two days after the first issue appeared of Richard Harwood's *Holocaust News*, there came a call from the Institute of Jewish Affairs for Parliament to make denial of the Germans' alleged extermination of six million Jews a criminal offence. I shall watch with close interest the future actions of Jewish bodies like the Institute on this matter, for it looks as if the writing is on the wall. Concerted moves have already been made in a number of countries by organised Jewry to have dissenting views on the "six million" deemed beyond the law. Pressure has been put on the West German Government to draft suitable legislation, and in France the brave Professor Faurisson has been found guilty of "falsifying history" for attacking the "Holocaust" as bogus and threatened with three months jail if ever again he expresses his doubts. Britain is no exception to the hysteria that is whipped up about "gas chambers" in Western countries, so I have little doubt that before much longer the Home Secretary will be having prison space cleared to accommodate those brave people who are still willing to make a closer investigation of the "extermination" allegation than is declared to be good for them.

* * * *

Critics of the Metropolitan Police's decision to publish figures on the grossly disproportionate involvement of Blacks in muggings should explain what is so shocking about this, compared to figures which purported to show Blacks were disproportionately assaulted by Whites. Last year, race relations agitators wanted such statistics released to fuel their demand for special police squads to arrest "racists". Are we again seeing the double-standard at work?

THE BOOK NOOK: cheap second-hand books for intelligent readers. Send stamp for descriptive lists on *History, World War II, Travel, Novels, etc.* 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, Sussex.